

1. There are important social and ethical implications of DNA analysis. Already, DNA testing can reveal the presence of markers of certain genetic diseases, such as Huntington's. So, who should have access to your genetic profile? Health insurance companies? College admissions offices? Employers? What issues about confidentiality are raised by genetic testing? Who owns your DNA and its information?
2. Suppose a DNA test that predicted your chances of getting a disease, such as cancer, were available. You take the test for cancer, and the results say you have a two in three chance of getting cancer sometime in the next 20 years. Who should have access to this information? Your doctor? Health insurance companies? Employers? Would *you* want to know this information?
3. The Innocence Project (IP) is an international litigation and public policy organization dedicated to exonerating wrongfully convicted individuals through DNA testing. Three-quarters of DNA exoneration cases involve misidentification by witnesses. To date, nearly 300 people previously convicted of serious crimes in the U.S. have been exonerated by DNA testing. However, not everyone is in favor of the IP. One United States Supreme Court justice expressed concern that DNA testing poses risks to the criminal justice system, in which a person is judged by a jury of peers. What social and ethical issues are raised by using DNA evidence to re-examine old court decisions? What other arguments can you make (or find) against using DNA evidence for court cases?